Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRITANIE HALLMON,

Plaintiff,

v.

STANISLAUS COUNTY HUMAN RESOURCE DEPT., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-05289-DMR

## ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE

On August 23, 2019, pro se Plaintiff Britanie Hallmon filed a complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP") in the Northern District of California. [Docket No. 1 ("Compl.").] She alleges claims for employment discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 against Defendant Stanislaus County and various individuals who appear to be employed by Stanislaus County. Stanislaus County is in the Eastern District of California.

On October 25, 2019, the court issued an order to show cause as to why this case should not be transferred to the Eastern District. [Docket No. 6.] The court noted that "it appears all defendants in this case reside in Stanislaus County and all the events underlying the allegations in the complaint occurred in Stanislaus County." Id. at 2. Under the venue rules set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), it appeared that the case should have been filed in the Eastern District. *Id.* The court ordered Ms. Hallmon to explain why the case was properly filed in the Northern District. On November 12, 2019, Ms. Hallmon responded and stated that she has no objection to transferring the case to the Eastern District. [Docket No. 7.]

The court finds that venue is not proper in the Northern District. The Clerk is ordered to transfer this case to the Eastern District of California.

## United States District Court Northern District of California

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 15, 2019

Jum

DONNA M. RYU

United States Magistrate Judge